

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 11-15, 21-25, and 31-67 are pending, in which claims 1, 11, and 21 are independent. Independent claims 1, 11, and 21 have been amended. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments. Favorable reconsideration and reexamination of the action mailed on June 24, 2008 is respectfully requested in view of the forgoing amendments and the following comments of the Applicant, which are preceded by related comments of the Examiner in small bold type:

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 65-67 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected bas claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Applicant acknowledges the allowability of claims 65-67 and thanks the Examiner for the suggestion to rewrite these claims in independent form. Based on this suggestion, the Applicant has amended the independent claims 1, 11, and 21 with respective subject matter of claims 65-67.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-5, 11-15, 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haggard et al. (USPN 6,148,335) in view of Robinson et al. (USPN 6,570,867) in further view of Abraham (USPN 5,983,270).

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites “validating the correlations based on an analysis of one or more parameters associated with the user interactions, wherein the parameters associated with the user interactions include at least one parameter selected from the group consisting of byte-density, URL count, and unique IP address count” For example, URL-count and unique-IP-address-count may be used to estimate “the sample size of the analysis space” and test it for sufficiency by comparing it to a threshold. (*See* Specification at p. 13 lines 11-19.) Abraham is not understood to disclose or suggest this feature of independent claim 1.

In contrast, Abraham describes a system for managing the communication of data packets between an intranetwork and an internetwork by filtering packets passing between the networks. (Abraham, Abstract.) In this system, a filter engine filters the packets based on rules determined by a filter executive, based in part upon mapping information stored in a database. (*Id.*) The “filter executive also communicates the mapping information stored in the database to a naming service manager which further updates the mapping information and returns the updated

mapping information to the filter executive. Consequently, the filter executive filters the data packets according to the most recent mapping information.” (*Id.*) In particular, the system performs a DNS (Domain Name Server) validation of each IP address stored in a IP log load table, “to determine if the IP address’s corresponding domain name has changed.” (Abraham, Fig. 15B, Fig. 24, col. 42, lines 45-62.) Thus, the system described by Abraham uses DNS validation to update network mapping information in a database and keep it current. The system described by Abraham is not understood to disclose or suggest validation of correlations by analysis of byte-density parameters, URL counts, or unique IP address counts.

As noted by the Examiner, Haggard is not understood to remedy the foregoing deficiency of Abraham. (Office Action at page 3, lines 7-13.) Further, Robinson is understood to be silent with respect to the use of these parameters associated with user interactions and therefore is not understood to remedy the foregoing deficiency of Abraham. For these reasons, the Applicant submits that claim 1 is not obvious in light of any combination of Haggard, Robinson, and Abraham.

Similarly, independent claims 11 and 21, as amended, each recite “validate the correlations based on an analysis of one or more parameters associated with the user interactions, wherein the parameters associated with the user interactions include at least one parameter selected from the group consisting of byte-density, URL count, and unique IP address count.” For the same reasons described above in relation to claim 1, claims 11 and 21 are not obvious in light of Haggard, Robinson, and Abraham. The applicant respectfully submits that claims 11 and 21 are allowable as currently amended.

The dependent claims 2-5, 12-15, 22-25 and 31-67 are allowable at least for the reasons discussed in their respective independent claims. Although it is believed that the dependent claims define patentably distinct features, given the distinctiveness of the respective independent claims, the dependent claims are not discussed here in detail.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above

Applicant : Bickerstaff, et al.
Serial No. : 09/471,964
Filed : December 23, 1999
Page : 15 of 15

Attorney's Docket No.: 24121-0096001 / N7615

may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the entire application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's attorney can be reached at the address shown below. Telephone calls regarding this application should be directed to 617-368-2191.

No fees are believed due at this time. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 24121-0096001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 23 September 2008



Jeffrey J. Barclay
Reg. No. 48,950

Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945

21994354.doc